



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES

A PAPYRUS MANUSCRIPT OF THE MINOR PROPHETS

Among the parchment and papyrus manuscripts and fragments brought to this country by the University of Michigan Expedition under Professor Francis W. Kelsey, only one is of paramount interest to the Biblical scholar. There are indeed lectionaries and parts of lectionaries dating from the eleventh century and later, and even a single papyrus fragment of a Psalm, but the former are uninteresting textually, and the latter is too small to give much evidence.

The papyrus manuscript of the Minor Prophets formed a part of a previous purchase made in Egypt in 1916 for Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and Mr. Charles L. Freer. Transportation was too hazardous to permit of bringing the manuscripts to America at that time. They were packed in a tin case which was sealed by the American consul and placed in the vault of a bank in Cairo.

After the armistice no one interested in the manuscripts was able to visit Egypt until last year, when the work of the University of Michigan Expedition brought Professor Kelsey to Cairo. The case containing the manuscripts was received and opened by him. On account of their fragile nature all the manuscripts were taken by Professor Kelsey to Rome, where the material obtained for Mr. Morgan, chiefly Coptic, was delivered to Professor Hyvernat. The Greek papyrus was forwarded through the American Embassy to the Library of the University of Michigan, where it will remain until the editorial work has been finished. It will then be placed in the Freer Gallery in Washington, to which the Greek parchment manuscripts in the Freer Collection have already been transferred.

There remains of this manuscript 28 leaves, written on both sides, and rather numerous fragments. The size of the leaves is at present about 5 inches wide by 9 inches long. A little margin is preserved in places on each side and at the bottom, but at the top the margin and 9 or 10 lines are missing. As 38 or 39 lines are preserved on most pages, the original manuscript probably had 48 lines to the page. The length of the line is four and one-fourth inches, and it contains on the average about 30 letters. If we allow for an inch of margin all the way around, the original size of the leaf was about 6 by 12 inches.

The manuscript appeared at first sight to be in book form, but no traces of binding were found, nor had there been any in the period immediately preceding the burial or loss of the manuscript.

When I opened the manuscript the pages were photographed as the leaves were separated, being numbered 1, 1^v, etc. When the leaves thus numbered were compared with the Greek text, I found that two leaves, 14 and 15, had been turned over together without affecting the neighboring ones, and leaves 20 and 21 had been turned over separately so as to bring the backside of each first. At the time this happened it seems likely that there was no binding. In fact it may well be that there never was a binding, but that these long, narrow leaves were kept in a pile and perhaps numbered to keep them in order. The length of the sheets, the broad column of writing, the crowding of the writing, all point to a special effort to keep the manuscript, or rather the pile of sheets, as thin as possible. A manuscript of such a form may well have been kept and carried about in a box or wallet, as the Irish missionaries carried their Bibles.

I have made no attempt as yet to read and place the fragments. The entire leaves give the text from Amos 7, 9 to Malachi 2, 9, with the lacunae caused by the missing tops of the leaves. The manuscript has a small number of accents, all seemingly from a later hand. They are in general accurate, and are similar to those now in use. Punctuation is more frequent, both single and double dots occurring, and these likewise seem to be from a later hand. Iota adscript appears infrequently, as does the rough breathing in the half H and square forms, both from the hand of the original scribe as well as from a corrector. Dots over initial iota and upsilon and an apostrophe after proper nouns ending in a consonant are rare and from first hand. There are many corrections, some from a hand probably contemporary, others from one later. Both used good sources. Abbreviations are rather infrequent, only *κύριος*, *θεός*, *άνθρωπος*, *πνεύμα*, and *ισραηλ* being regularly abbreviated.

The writing is a sloping uncial of the oval type, but more cursive than any literary manuscript of like size that I know except parts of Aristotle's Constitution of Athens. Papyrus publications of the past thirty years have furnished a wealth of examples of this sloping hand which was once called rare and late. It is fairly common from the first century to the seventh, and the so-called Slavonic uncial on parchment is its direct descendant. The types of this hand in use in the Roman period, *i.e.*, up to about 350 A.D., and in the Byzantine, are easily distinguishable. The exaggerated size of some letters, and

the cruder, heavier stroke, mark the later period. Our manuscript belongs in the Roman period, and not at its very end; though more cursive in character, it compares well in breadth of letter and in character of stroke with many third century examples. In the sloping hand of the second century the letters are somewhat broader.

The odd mixture of cursive and literary characters in a hand which is plainly trying to avoid cursive makes the hand hard to date exactly. A good document to compare is No. 72 of Vol. II of the Amherst Papyri, Plate xviii, from the year 246. Our manuscript does not use the cursive forms of most letters consistently, and it sometimes varies, offering other cursive forms not found in No. 72. Yet the general resemblance combined with characteristic forms of certain letters point to a third century date. Thus *omicron* is consistently small, sometimes appearing as a mere dot, and never equal in size to the other letters. The *sigma* regularly has a flat top which does not bend forward or droop. A form of *kappa* shaped like a small cursive U is of frequent occurrence. Also other cursive forms of less frequent use point to a third century date. A facsimile of one page of the manuscript has been given in the Michigan *Alumnus* for February, 1921. I am sure that the manuscript can not be placed later than 325 A.D., and I am at present inclined to date it in the second half of the third century.

One expects much from the oldest existing manuscript of any considerable portion of the Bible, and I believe we shall not be disappointed. Its value can be suggested by a few noteworthy readings drawn from different places in the text.

In Micah 1, 15, the reading is $\eta \delta\omicron\zeta\alpha \tau\eta\varsigma \theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma \text{Ισραηλ}$, but Ισραηλ was carefully crossed out by the third hand, which has done much good correcting in the manuscript. The corrections by this hand do not seem to represent conjectures but manuscript authority. In this passage we might assume that Ισραηλ has been deleted because of a misplaced obelus belonging to $\theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma$, but there is, I think, a better explanation pointing to an older text. In the Aldine edition and some later manuscripts $\Sigma\iota\omega\nu$ stands for Ισραηλ . It is a commonplace of textual criticism that such variations often point to an earlier omission, which we now find in this old papyrus manuscript. It is not necessary to assume that the omission was original in the Septuagint, though it may have been. The expression, "until the glory of the daughter shall come to Odollam," suggested the completion "daughter of Zion," if not "daughter of Israel." Any family of manuscripts omitting the word would naturally have it supplied by

conjecture, if there was no manuscript handy in which it could be found. Its deletion in our manuscript indicates a desire to keep to the simpler and so perhaps older form of text.

In Micah 4, 3, the Papyrus reads *τας ζιβυνας* for *τα δορατα*. The manuscripts A, Q*, 26, 40, 49, etc. support this reading, as does also the Syro-Hexaplar. Likewise Justin Martyr cites this passage with *ζιβυνας* in his text. The word *ζιβυνη* with its parallel forms *σιβυνη*, *σιγγυνη*, *συβανη*, etc. was common in Macedonian Greek. It means a hunting-spear or any light spear. It was a dialectical word, but one sure to be known throughout the empire of Alexander. It occurs in the Septuagint in three other passages, Isaiah 2, 4, and Jeremiah 6, 22, without variant, and in Judith 1, 15, where some manuscripts spell with a sigma. The common word *δορυ* is found over fifty times in the Septuagint, and so is apt to have been substituted for the rare *ζιβυνη* by later scholars.

In Micah 7, 12, this manuscript has *Συριας, ημερα υδατος και θορυβου* for *και απο θαλασσης εως θαλασσης και απο ορους εως του ορους*. The Alexandrinus adds *Συριας* at this point and the rest of the substitute as an addition after *ορους*², being supported in the latter addition by many cursives; while Q* agrees with our manuscript in giving this reading as a substitute for the regular text, which has however been added in the margin by Q². The common reading agrees well with the Hebrew, from which this variant represents a decided departure. The fact that it omits the second and third parallels, "from sea to sea and from mountain to mountain," tends to show its primitive character. The first parallel in the Septuagint, "from Tyre to the river," does not match well with the others, for it seems to be individual while they are general. A double interpretation of the Hebrew was noted as possible by Hieronymus. If the second and third parallels are omitted, such an addition as *Συριας* seems necessary to make the sense complete. As regards the addition, "a day of rain and confusion," we can only say that it is Hebrew in style and fits in well with verses 11 and 12. The form in our manuscript and in Q* shows less inconsistency than that in the other manuscripts of the Septuagint, which may argue for its primitive character. In any case we see here a parallel to the standard Hebrew text and not a derivative from it. All manuscripts showing both expressions, as the Alexandrinus, are of a secondary character.

In Obadiah vs. 16, is found the addition *πιονται παντα τα εθνη οινον* before *πιονται*, as in 8^a, A, and some later manuscripts, while Q and

others are reported for a different order. This addition conforms to the Massoretic text, makes the Greek more intelligible by adding the necessary subject for *πιονται*, and what is more important, forms a stronger verse. When we consider that we can explain the regular Septuagint text as an ordinary omission by homoeoteleuton, the jump from *πιονται*¹ to *πιονται*² causing the loss of 23 letters, or about a line of an ancient manuscript, it seems best to consider the longer form original in the Septuagint.

In Zephaniah 1, 3, after *θαλασσης* is the addition *και σκανδαλ[α συν ασεβειων]*, but the same hand or one of about the same time has deleted the phrase with a small dot over each letter. Hieronymus and cod. 86 mg. testify that this addition is from Symmachus. It is found also in the minuscules 36, 238, and 240. The fact that it was deleted in our manuscript, probably by the diorthotes, shows that it was recognized as an addition, perhaps marked as coming from Symmachus, and so was deleted.

In Zechariah 14, 17, the papyrus adds at the end, *και ουκ εσται επ' αυτοις νετος*. It is supported here only by the Aldine edition, codd. 36, 51, and a few others. We know from Hieronymus that this is approximately the true translation of the Hebrew as given by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Aquila seems to have had *ομβρος* for *νετος*. Again we may have the rendering of Symmachus or an independent adaptation to the Hebrew appearing in our manuscript, but this time it is conflate and not deleted.

In Zephaniah 3, 10, our manuscript reads *δεσμενοι μου εν [τοις δ]ιεσκορπισμενοις* for *προσδεξομαι εν διεσπαρμενοις μου*, but the addition was deleted by dots over most of the letters. The manuscripts A, Q, 26, 49, etc. omit from *προσδεξομαι* to *μου*, which is marked by an asterisk in the Syro-Hexaplar. It is from Theodotion. Symmachus as quoted by Theodoret is quite different. Aquila is not preserved for this verse. The form in our manuscript is so good, and agrees so well with the Massoretic text, that it seems best again to assume that a gloss drawn from another translation of the Hebrew has crept into the text. The fact that this also is deleted tends to confirm the surmise that the glosses were so marked that the diorthotes detected them. Perhaps a phrase from the translation by Aquila has been preserved here.

In Habakkuk 3, 1, we find *υπερ των αγνοιων* added after *ωδης*. This is a translation of the Hebrew, as we see from Hieronymus, who quotes Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Yet *αγνοιων* is not

found there, the nearest approach being *αγνοημάτων* found in two of the translations. Either some unknown translation or the original Hebrew has influenced our manuscript at this point.

In Zechariah 1, 3, this manuscript omits the first *λεγει Κυριος των δυναμεων* and *των δυναμεων* of the second. The first of these expressions is omitted elsewhere only in the Holmes and Parsons cursives 36, 40, 49, etc., and the second in 130, 239, 311. *κ** has the first *λεγει Κυριος* with *παντοκρατωρ* for *των δυναμεων*, but all were deleted by the second hand and *παντοκρατωρ* deleted a second time by the third hand. Also for the second *των δυναμεων* we find *παντοκρατωρ* in A, Q, 26, 40, etc. Yet the Syro-Hexaplar marks both with an asterisk as derived from Theodotion. Our manuscript alone preserves the original Septuagint in both cases, though it is supported by the second hand of *κ* for the first omission.

In Zechariah 11, 13, this manuscript adds *κη* (for *και*) *καθηκα* before *και ενεβαλον*. It is supported only by codd. 61, 62, 86, and some others. This is considered a case of repetition or double interpretation, but in fact the meanings are hardly similar enough to warrant this conclusion. Neither do Aquila nor Symmachus have this verb, though both are preserved. I have so far found no case where this manuscript reproduces a reading from Theodotion. As given here the whole sentence may be interpreted: "And I took the thirty pieces of silver and sent them down (or, went down) and cast them into the house of the Lord into the smelting furnace." If we assume that this represents, not a double interpretation, but an older form of the Hebrew text, it is not hard to understand why the Massoretic and the later translations should have succeeded in eliminating the phrase from the Septuagint manuscripts, especially when assisted by such a corrupt form as appears in this old papyrus.

In Zechariah 13, 1, this manuscript, supported by Q and four cursives, omits the whole phrase, *και τοις κατοικουσιν το χωρισμον*. B^a, *κ*¹, 86, 22, 23, 238, mark it with asterisks or similar signs. As the Syro-Hexaplar also marks it as an insertion from Theodotion, there can be no question that our manuscript preserves the correct text, though with little support.

In conclusion I may add what has been hinted by the above discussed readings. The new manuscript almost never goes with B¹ when it is opposed by the other old uncials. Its nearest relative is Q, though it lacks much of Q's later material. At times it goes with the later cursives only. The first scribe made a good many mistakes which were later corrected; both forms will be instructive. Thus far the

manuscript seems free from the influence of Theodotion, Origen, and the later editions. On the other hand it is going to give us a clearer insight into the amount and kind of corruption which preceded Origen.

HENRY A. SANDERS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR, MICH.

CEPHAS AND PETER IN THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

In his note 'Simon, Cephas, Peter' in this *Review* (January, 1921, pp. 95-97), Professor Kirsopp Lake, calling attention to the existence of early evidence that in some quarters Cephas was thought to be a different person from Peter, wonders why "Christian tradition has so completely lost sight of these doubts, which were clearly present in various forms to Clement of Alexandria and to the still earlier writer of the *Epistola Apostolorum*."

As a matter of fact Christian tradition never lost sight completely of these doubts. This was due primarily to controversial reasons which led the expositors of the New Testament to attempt edifying explanations of the quarrel of Cephas and Paul at Antioch related in the Epistle to the Galatians. It seems that very early dissenters from the great church made the most of that episode to belittle the value of the unity and consistency of the Apostolic tradition boasted by the *καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*. Of the Marcionites, for instance, Tertulian says: "Proponunt ergo ad suggillandum ignorantiam aliquam apostolorum, quod Petrus et qui cum eo reprehensi sunt a Paulo . . ." etc. (*De praescr. haeret.* 23), and again: "Ipsum Petrum caeterosque columnas apostolatus a Paulo reprehensos opponunt, quod non recto pede incederent ad Evangelii veritatem" (*Adv. Marcionem*, i, 20; iv, 3; v, 3). It seems that Porphyry also made caustic comments on the apostolic quarrel: "Porphyrio . . . blasphemanti, qui Pauli arguit procacitatem, quod principem Apostolorum Petrum ausus est reprehendere et arguere in faciem . . ." (Jerome, Ep. cxii, 6, ad Augustinum); and finally the emperor Julian accused Peter of hypocrisy: *κατασκώπτει δὲ πρὸς τοῦτοις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἔκκριτον Πέτρον ὁ γεννάδας καὶ ὑποκριτὴν εἶναί φησι, καὶ ἐλλελέγχθαι διὰ τοῦ Παύλου, ὥς ποτε μὲν τοῖς Ἑλλήνων ἔθεσι διαζῆν σπουδάζοντα, ποτὲ δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδαίων, ἡννοηκῶς εἰσάπαν τὴν ἐν γε τοῦτοις εὐτεχεστάτην οἰκονομίαν* (Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Julianum*, lib. ix. P. G. lxxvi, 1000-01).